

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/826,505	04/05/2001	Scott Casavant	PD-200359	7900
7590 06/14/2005			EXAMINER	
Hughes Electronics Corporation			DAVIS, CYNTHIA L	
Patent Docket A	Administration			
Bldg. 1, Mail Stop A109			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 956			2665	
El Segundo, Ca	A 90245-0956			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•		( <b>3</b> \				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	_			
	09/826,505	CASAVANT, ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Cynthia L Davis	2665				
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a individual of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed  irty (30) days will be considered timely.  DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/3	21/2005.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims		·				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18,21 and 22</u> is/are pending in th	ne application.	•				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18 and 21-22</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to t	he drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corr	ection is required if the drawin	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority docume		Application No.				
2. Conics of the partition conics of the priority docume		· · ·				
<ol> <li>Copies of the certified copies of the participation from the International Bure</li> </ol>		in received in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a l		ot received.				
Attachment(s)						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	o(s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/ Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/21/2005</u>.</li> </ol>	6)  Other: _					

### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McMullan in view of Williams.

Regarding claim 1, receiving a broadcast information stream at a first data rate at a headed is disclosed in column 2, lines 5-7. Inserting one or more packets from a local information stream into the broadcast information stream to form a combined information stream is disclosed in column 2, lines 7-14, and column 1, lines 7-12 (the system is a digital transmission system, which would involve information transmitted in packet form). Transmitting the combined information stream to the user device at a second data rate is disclosed in column 2, lines 12-14. Claim 1 further specifies identifying and replacing erroneous packets received in the broadcast data stream with local information, which is missing from McMullan. However, Williams discloses in column 3, lines 52-55, replacing erroneously received packets with local information in order to hide audio impairment. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace the erroneously received packets in McMullan's

Art Unit: 2665

system as is taught by Williams. The motivation would be to hide impairment of the received data stream that might be caused by the erroneous packets.

Regarding claim 4, combining a broadcast information stream at a first data rate and a local information stream to form a combined information stream at a second data rate is disclosed in column 2, lines 5-9. Receiving the combined information stream at the user device is disclosed in column 2, lines 12-14. Claim 4 further specifies identifying and replacing erroneous packets received in the broadcast data stream with local information, which is missing from McMullan. However, Williams discloses in column 3, lines 52-55, replacing erroneously received packets with local information in order to hide audio impairment. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace the erroneously received packets in McMullan's system as is taught by Williams. The motivation would be to hide impairment of the received data stream that might be caused by the erroneous packets.

Regarding claim 7, receiving a broadcast information stream including one or more packets unusable to the user device and inserting one or more local information packets in place of the unusable packets to form a combined information stream is disclosed in column 1, lines 7-16 (the local information in the digital transmission system may be used to replace control information from the broadcast system that is unusable by the user device). Transmitting the combined information stream to the user device is disclosed in column 2, lines 12-14. Claim 7 further specifies identifying and replacing erroneous packets received in the broadcast data stream with local information, which is missing from McMullan. However, Williams discloses in column 3, lines 52-55,

Art Unit: 2665

replacing erroneously received packets with local information in order to hide audio impairment. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace the erroneously received packets in McMullan's system as is taught by Williams. The motivation would be to hide impairment of the received data stream that might be caused by the erroneous packets.

Regarding claim 10, a headend coupled to the user device is disclosed in figure 1a, element 102, and column 3, line 24. A local information source and broadcast information source coupled to the headend is disclosed in column 1, lines 7-12. Receiving a broadcast information stream from the broadcast information source at a first data rate is disclosed in column 2, lines 5-7. Inserting one or more packets from a local information stream from the local information source into the broadcast information stream to form a combined information stream is disclosed in column 1, lines 7-12. Transmitting the combined information stream to the user device at a second data rate is disclosed in column 2, lines 12-14. Claim 10 further specifies identifying and replacing erroneous packets received in the broadcast data stream with local information, which is missing from McMullan. However, Williams discloses in column 3, lines 52-55, replacing erroneously received packets with local information in order to hide audio impairment. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace the erroneously received packets in McMullan's system as is taught by Williams. The motivation would be to hide impairment of the received data stream that might be caused by the erroneous packets.

Regarding claim 13, a broadcast information stream at a first data rate, a local information stream, combining the broadcast information stream and the local information stream at a second data rate, and receiving the combined information stream at the user device is disclosed in column 1, lines 7-12, and column 2, lines 5-14. Claim 13 further specifies identifying and replacing erroneous packets received in the broadcast data stream with local information, which is missing from McMullan. However, Williams discloses in column 3, lines 52-55, replacing erroneously received packets with local information in order to hide audio impairment. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace the erroneously received packets in McMullan's system as is taught by Williams. The motivation would be to hide impairment of the received data stream that might be caused by the erroneous packets.

Regarding claims 2, 5, 8, 11, and 14, the user device including a TV or set-top box is disclosed in figure 1b, elements 151 and 152.

Regarding claims 3, 6, 9, and 12, the first data rate being around 30Mbps is disclosed in column 7, lines 42-43 (33.8 mbps is around 30). The second data rate being less than 100kbps is missing from McMullan. However, there is no support in the specification of the instant application for criticality of this value. It is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on the applicant. In re

Application/Control Number: 09/826,505

Art Unit: 2665

<u>Mason</u>, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937), <u>Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v.</u> <u>U.S.</u>, 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 417 (1943).

Regarding claim 15, the first data rate being around 20Mbps and the second data rate being around 25 Mbps is missing from McMullan. However, there is no support in the specification of the instant application for criticality of these numbers. It is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on the applicant. In re

Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937), Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v.

U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 417 (1943).

3. Claims 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McMullan in view of Karawai.

Regarding claim 16, a headend coupled to the user device, a local information source coupled to the headend, a broadcast information source coupled to the headend, receiving a broadcast information stream including one or more packets unneeded by the user device, inserting one or more local packets in place of the unneeded packets to form a combined information stream, and transmitting the combined information stream to the user device is disclosed in column 1, lines 7-16, and column 2, lines 5-14. Claim 16 further specifies identifying blank packets received in the broadcast data stream and replacing them with local information, which is missing from McMullan. However, Kawarai discloses in column 1, lines 45-50, replacing blank cells in a datastream with locally generated control information. It would have been

obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace blank packets with local information packets. The motivation would be to reserve bandwidth for the local information packets (Karawai, column 1, lines 51-55).

Regarding claim 17, the user device including a TV or set-top box is disclosed in figure 1b, elements 151 and 152.

Regarding claim 18, the first data rate being around 30Mbps is disclosed in column 7, lines 42-43 (33.8 mbps is around 30). The second data rate being less than 100kbps is missing from McMullan. However, there is no support in the specification of the instant application for criticality of this value. It is generally considered to be within the ordinary skill in the art to adjust, vary, select, or optimize the numerical parameters or values of any system absent a showing of criticality in a particular recited value. The burden of showing criticality is on the applicant. In re Mason, 87 F.2d 370, 32 USPQ 242 (CCPA 1937), Marconi Wireless Telegraph Co. v. U.S., 320 U.S. 1, 57 USPQ 417 (1943).

4. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McMullan in view of Williams in further view of Kawarai.

Regarding claims 21 and 22, identifying blank packets received in the broadcast stream and inserting one or more packets from the local information stream to replace the blank packets is missing from McMullan. However, Kawarai discloses in column 1, lines 45-50, replacing blank cells in a datastream with locally generated control information. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replace blank packets with local information packets. The motivation would

be to reserve bandwidth for the local information packets (Karawai, column 1, lines 51-55).

#### Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cynthia L Davis whose telephone number is (571) 272-3117. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 to 6, Monday to Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Huy Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3155. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 09/826,505

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2665

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Page 9

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**